

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 21, 22, 25-28, 30-34, 36, 37, 39 and 42 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9 of U.S. Patent No.: 6,373,470.

A terminal disclaimer is filed herewith to overcome the double patenting rejection.

Also filed herewith are formal drawings.

It should be pointed out that there are inconsistencies in the claims rejected in the office action summary and the claims actually rejected in the office action. The office action summary rejects claims 1, 22, 25-28, 30-34, 36, 37, 39 and 42, while the actual rejection rejects claims 21, 22, 25-28, 30-34, 36, 37, 39 and 42. Since claim 1 has been cancelled it is believed that this is a typographical error. Further, although claim 20 is referred to in the body of the rejection it is not referred to in the rejection heading. In addition, the actual pending claims do not match the pending claims indicated in the office action summary. In particular, claim 20 has been left out of the pending claims in the office action summary. As stated in the previous response, and as indicated in the listing of claims above, claim 20 is still pending in the application. These are also believed to be typographical errors.

Because there are no other rejections, Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



Quin C. Hoellwarth
Reg. No. 45, 738

P.O. Box 778
Berkeley, CA 94704-0778
(650) 961-8300